

STUDIES IN ARMENIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

FOREWORD

In the following pages I have attempted to sketch the content of three books of major importance, all three related respectively to the Armenian literature, christology, and historiography.

The study on *The Refutation of the Sects* by Eznik of Kolb was read at the International Conference on Patristic Studies, in Oxford, England, in September 1971, with the emphasis on the doctrine of the Free Will as explored by the fifth century Armenian author. *Scholia De Incarnatione Unigeniti* is the only surviving Armenian version of the great fifth century Greek theologian Cyril of Alexandria, whose christology, based on the Incarnate Logos and built on the economy-salvation pattern, became the firm doctrine of the Armenian Church christology, even before the Council of Chalcedon in 451. *De Administrando Imperio* is a unique source for the late Byzantine period by an emperor himself who has dedicated chapters of indispensable importance both on the borderland Armenian provinces, and on the double policy of the Empire: expansion and colonization. The third study of this booklet contains an introduction to those chapters and some parallel data with the contemporary Armenian historiography.

* * *

The author, the Very Rev. Zaven Arzoumanian, came to the United States in 1962 after completing his undergraduate work in the University of London, England. From 1963-71 he assumed the pastorate of the Holy Trinity Armenian parish in Philadelphia, and in the meantime worked for his Master's degree at Temple University, earning his degree in church history. While serving as the Primate's vicar in Canada in 1972-73, Rev. Arzoumanian worked on his Ph.D. in Armenian studies at Columbia University, New York City.

“THE REFUTATION OF THE SECTS” BY EZNIK OF KOLB

The fifth century Armenian literature is enriched with an original and unique treatise known as *Yeghz Aghandots*, (*Elc Alandoc'*),¹ an apology of Christianity and a polemic against the existing religious-philosophic thoughts. The specialist scholar on Eznik, L. Maries, states that this little book is classified among the most important monuments in the apologetic literature of its time.² The author, an Armenian doctor Eznik by name, born c. 374-380, is widely known as one of the reliable church fathers³ by virtue of his work, *The Refutation of the Sects*, which survives in one single manuscript and has been translated into the leading western languages. A much closer interest among the Armenian, German and French scholars grew ever since the only existing manuscript of Eznik's work was discovered by H. Acairean in 1902.⁴ The manuscript, now treasured in the Matenadaran of Erevan (number 1097), was written in 1280 by Luser most probably in the monastery of Glajor, in Vayoc' Jor (modern Armenia) and was dedicated to the famous teachers of that famous school of 13th century, Nerses Msec'i and Esayi Nc'ec'i.⁵ It was believed that the manuscript, after its second publication in Venice in 1826, was destroyed in the fire of Smyrna in 1845, until it was discovered some sixty years later in the library of Ejmiacin. The first publication of the work was done in Smyrna in 1762.

It must be noted from the outset that Eznik's treatise has revealed problems of different sorts. L. Maries observes at once that the nature

of the treatise—on God—casts light on the composition of the book and on related problems, such as sources and integrity of the text.⁶ The two publications and the two translations, into French by Le Vaillant de Florival in 1853, and into German by J. M. Schmid in 1900, of the said work, all done before the discovery of the manuscript, had created problems of different readings and editings. After Acarean's scholarly examination of the manuscript and of its collation with the 1826 edition, some fundamental errors of semantics were corrected. The well qualified critical edition of the text with its French translation⁷ by L. Maries in 1959 minimized the erroneous readings of the different editions. The recently published critical edition of the text in modern Armenian in 1970 by A. A. Abrahamyan further elucidated the integrity of the text, by the help of the introduction, the translated text, the critical notes and the bibliography.⁸ The other serious problem in connection with the sources used by Eznik was widely discussed first by Grigoris Galemk'earean⁹ and later by L. Maries.¹⁰ Thus, the content and the compilation, on the one hand, and the highly esteemed literary style of the classical Armenian on the other, compel the reader of this book to look upon it in different and specific perspectives: religious, philosophic, literary and perhaps also political. It will be the aim of this essay to abide mainly on the philological problems that are raised by many leading scholars and by various publications, editings and translations. An attempt will be made to discuss some of the essential religious-philosophic argumentations, to present the history of the manuscript and to look through the source problems.

The life of Eznik casts some light on the content of his book since he was a leading bishop in the Armenian church during the persecutions of the Armenian Christians by the Persians. It is believed that his career warranted Eznik to refute Zoroastrian religion and prepare a manual apology in defence of Christianity at the time preceding the religious conflict of 451. Eznik's birthplace is associated with the village Kolb in the province of Taik, just off the border of present day Armenia. Koriwn¹¹ relates that the inventors of the Armenian alphabet, Sahak and Mesrop, had sent the "two brother disciples" Hovsep' and Eznik to Edessa to have them translate from the Syriac "the traditions of their holy fathers" into Armenian. The latter

“brother” is identified as “Eznik from the province of Ayarat and from the village of Kolb”. Later, the same disciples went to Constantinople with a similar mission as translators of the hellenic literature. This was the year when the Third Ecumenical Council had convened in Ephesus in 431, and Eznik, while in Constantinople, became aware of the doctrinal and christological issues discussed at the Nicaean (325) and Ephesian (431) councils. A letter, ascribed to Eznik and addressed to Mesrop pertaining to the decisions of the second council, is preserved as a doctrinal document.¹² Soon afterward the two “brethren”, according to Koriwn,¹³ left Constantinople for Armenia carrying with them reliable copies of the Scriptures as well as of the decisions of both councils. There they undertook the valuable task of assisting in the translation of the Bible into Armenian.

Eznik of Kolb is also mentioned by his contemporary historians Elise¹⁴ and Lazar P’arpec’i¹⁵ who introduce him as “the bishop of Bagrewand”, in the ancient district of Ayarat, and in this capacity as an attendant to the important council of Artasat in 449. It is much feasible that the bishop was the same as the author of *The Refutation*, since the main business of the council was to reject the Zoroastrian religion in an answer to Yezdegerd II (438-457) of the Persians. This answer contained much the same principles and attitudes as we find in the second chapter of Eznik’s treatise. “This is an indication,” says Abrahamyan, “that the bishop of Bagrewand who attended the council of Artasat, was none other than the fifth-century philosopher Eznik.”¹⁶ Abrahamyan disagrees with Adontz who rejects the possibility of identifying the bishop of Bagrewand with Eznik of Kolb.¹⁷ L. Maries is quite sure that Elise’s letter¹⁸ of the bishops of Artasat in response to the edict of Mihr Nerseh was sealed by Eznik, who had inspired his colleagues and had contributed to the development of the profession of faith in the answer. He adds: “It appears to us that the contribution of Eznik in the redaction of this document has been rather personal and more direct.”¹⁹ No further information about the rest of Eznik’s life is reported by any historian. Let us state, however, that for reasons of internal evidences Eznik most probably wrote his apology-polemic between the years 441 and 448.²⁰ Eznik refers to

Zoroastrianism as not being spelled out in writing; he says:

*"And because the religious cults are not presented in writing, sometimes they [the religious leaders] explain them orally and deceive [the hearers]."*²¹

J. Schmid²² takes this record as an indication that Eznik's book was not written any later than 442 or 449, since Yezdegerd II, the king of Persia and the ruler of Persarmenia, had included in the edict of Mihr Nerseh his religion *in writing* only in 442, and the same was submitted to the council of Artasat in 449. On the other hand, *The Refutation* could not have been written before 431, simply because Eznik does not recognize the Armenian Arcasid kingdom which ended in 428, while mentioning Theodosius II, the emperor, and the Sassanid rule, in general.²³ Again, Marcion's teaching threatened the Armenian church only after Mesrop's death in 441. Eznik reacted against Marcion's religion in refuting it just after that date. This is how Weber establishes a date for Eznik's treatise between 441 and 448, but more correctly, after 445.

As mentioned earlier, several editions and translations have made *The Refutation* an important source for early Christianity and for the latter's superiority over the Greek, Persian and Gnostic religions. Eznik had to cope with the time and its demands with the intention of proclaiming the true teaching concerning God. Inasmuch as he thus initiates the theoretical approach of Christianity, he nevertheless aims at some concrete and practical purpose, namely, to teach the truth by convincing argumentations. It is L. Maries again who is convinced that the treatise is an apology on God—*De Deo*—and that is why his two major studies are given this specific title. "We do not have," he states, "in Eznik's work four separate polemics each being addressed to a specific adversary; but one treatise on God, *De Deo*, as we call it in a course of theology It is quite correct to say that Eznik's adversaries were the Greeks, the Persians and the Marcionites. This is correct from the point of view of doctrine, as well as considering the geographical implications, since the three dangerous currents converged into Armenia which was situated at the cross-roads of Greece, Asia Minor, Persia and Syria. But Eznik does not take each

adversary to refute them separately; it is from an angle of philosophy and theology that he looks upon them".²⁴ This evaluation, as one can see, isolates the work and limits its motivations into an exclusively theological and speculative content. Not too many scholars agree with Maries who is stretching his point to a degree where the historical value of the treatise is almost lost. In refuting the different religions or sects Eznik is ultimately fighting against historical and geographic enemies, for the sake of self-defense of a nation who has just started to co-exist among the neighboring nations. It is not easy to concur with Maries' oversimplification when he prefers to see in Eznik a complete apologist of monotheism for the sake of praising the true God alone. The historic dimension of the treatise was equally, and obviously more, the demand of the time and of the environment, such as reaction to Zoroastrianism which was the immediate religious-political danger for Armenia. From this point of view Eznik's philosophy was tangible and historical since it encountered the urgent problems of the time both conscientiously and theoretically.²⁵ Adontz and Xac'eryan have reacted to Maries' attitude in their own articles.²⁶

Advocating his main thesis of an exclusive monotheism in Eznik, Maries²⁷ distinguishes three larger categories of men: the *artak'ink'*, the "outsiders", and the *nerk'ink'*, the "insiders"; those who are outside of the church and those who are within the church. Apart from these stand the *herjowacolk'*, the heretics, who pretend to be part of the church but in reality they are not. Maries does not make clear the opposition of the first two groups, except that they "are opposed" to each other because the *artak'ink'* "are the truth" and the *nerk'ink'* "are the true faithful", and, further, that Eznik attacks the categories of the heretics from a unique angle: the knowledge of God. Eznik²⁸ is clear enough when he states that the *artak'ink'*, the non-Christians, are to be trained not by the holy Scriptures, but by the natural realities, whereas the *nerk'ink'* are to be instructed by the Scriptures. Eznik's strong logic and judgment, by means of dialectic, is the only weapon to attack pagan religions. While he raises specific questions by challenging their authors, Eznik uses dilemmas made up by two opposite sentences which, in turn, lead to

a certain conclusion. For example, to refute the existence of Zoroastrian deity he argues: whatever exists is either creator or creature. Zruan is not a creator, since Ormizd and Ahrmn are creators themselves, according to the religion. Likewise, Zruan is not a creature, because, according to the Persians, nothing greater than Zruan is acknowledged who could have been its creator. Thus, Zruan could have not existed at any given time. In his pursuit for establishing one true God, Eznik digs into the nature, like a scientist, and talks to the *artak'ink'*. Whereas scientific terms are still unavailable, Eznik is competent to find the necessary terms to use, even with synonyms, for the sake of emphasis. The four elements of the world, for example, are also called the four *hule*-s, or the four natures. Sometimes the author uses words with physical sense to denote abstract names. He also uses the technique of reversing the words, such as, "the thing which is, is greater than the thing which is in it", simply meaning that the container is greater than the contained.²⁹ Often Eznik uses tangible and concrete pictures to design the abstract. For example, the very first opening words of the treatise, whereby it is suggested the ways of exploring our attitude to understand the presence of the invisible and eternal being, are as follows:

*"If one wants to talk about the invisible and about its eternal power, one is bound first to clear his mind and his thoughts, since one is primarily a physical being . . . Like him who tries to look at the sun through its rays, he first has to clean his eyesight."*³⁰

Naturally, the theory that is being advocated here, namely, the exposition of the false religions and their refutation, is not Eznik's original. Rather, it was a common task among the church leaders up to the fifth century. Eznik's main contribution, however, has been the clarity of his illustrations, the complete and exhaustive study of each subject matter, and the classical literary style by which Eznik opens a first page in the Armenian apologetic literature. Very likely this style originated and stimulated the outlooks of the medieval Armenian philosophy and religion.

Another striking theme of Eznik's work is unsurprisingly similar to

that of the other church Fathers. This is the thesis of the free will, *anjnisanutun*, which, being a divine gift, now becomes a servant to man. It is primarily the problem of the good and the evil. Eznik's interest is not in the content of the evil or of the good; the question, rather, is whether the two can exist simultaneously as substances. His aim is to prove that the free will of man is responsible for evil, since the origin of the evil is beyond the limits of a good creator. The evil cannot be thought of as originating in God, nor is it uncreated matter, nor eternal God. This is what he says:

*"Nothing evil is created by the good God. There is no evil thing which is evil by nature. There is a creator not for the evil, but for the good."*³¹


*"It is obvious that the human beings are the creators of evil since they are those who can cause evil or who can prevent evil. [Consequently], we need not call evil things substances (persons), but only resulting from such substances."*³²

What Eznik is saying is that evil cannot come from God unless it is in him already in which case he is not absolute goodness. Nor can it arise from his mere act of creation, unless he is not strictly speaking the creator, but only the organizer of pre-existing material which is already of its own nature infected. As against fate, Eznik held to the reality of human freedom and to the transcendent goodness or to the omnipotence of God. Evil came neither from God's nature nor from his creative activity, nor again from any positive force acting independently of him, but solely from the abuse of the moral freedom with which he had endowed his creatures. Thus, the problem of freedom is neither a linguistic nor an ethically indifferent question. It is a permanent problem of thought. The problem of freedom, together with the manifestation of the evil, is grounded in human nature. This is the major analysis of Eznik's *anjnisanutun*. To discuss it is to raise the validity of the moral consciousness. Etymologically the term itself reveals the possessing of the free will by an act of free will, rather paradoxically. It has dual force: either it is a source of good or else it becomes equally the source of evil. In the first case Eznik's analysis is based on the voluntarily conforming to divine will by virtue of free-

dom's property of reason as the essential part of human nature. Thus we read:

*"The freedom of will, though a great divine gift bestowed upon man, now becomes a servant to man. Whereas all creatures are at the service of divine ordinance and exist in harmony by virtue of their creatureliness . . . the human being, being free in his will, serves anything he desires. He does not stop [doing evil] because of the powerful gifts that were bestowed upon him, nor by natural necessity, but only he benefits in obedience and hurts himself in disobedience."*³³

To Eznik's judgment free will is an ability characterizing man in his voluntary activity of choosing or not choosing a limited good when this is presented to him. Free will is the basis for asserting man's unique dignity among creatures, as well as for maintaining that he is a person. Eznik is not so much concerned with the proof of the existence of the free will as he is with the establishment of the roots of freedom and with its relation to reason. Man's freedom, he insists, is rooted in his intellect and will. And because of this man becomes the image of God.

aving considered some of the problems and their systematic treatment by Eznik, we now turn to the integrity of the text, to the problem of the sources and to the history both of the manuscript and the first two editions.

The allegedly destroyed unique manuscript of Eznik is thoroughly described and examined by H. Acarean in his above-mentioned book, in 1904.³⁴ In great amazement the manuscript was found on April 25, 1900 by Acarean and Ter-Mkrtc'ean who duly drew the attention of the Armenian and Western scholars. The manuscript is a collection of various biblical commentaries with 323 folios in total. On page 187b the following title appears: "Of Eznak Vardapet of Kolb, the Blessed Memory." Eznik's text begins with folio 187b and ends on folio 314b. There is a valuable colophon on page 145a, which reads:

"By the grace and mercy of God I, the incapable scribe Luser, completed the divine scripts for the enjoyment of the holy and all-praised vardapet Nerses. I beseech the

*hosts of the sons of light to remember the sinful scribe
and the heir of the manuscript, the rhetorician vardapet,
and may God have mercy upon all those who remember [us].
In the year of the Armenian calendar (729), 1280 A.D.*"³⁵

Other colophons inform that later the manuscript was read and corrected by T'ovma vardapet with the help of his disciple. Finally, it was repaired by Bolos in 1671. As we can see the manuscript does not bear a title except for the name of the author. Furthermore, "in the manuscript there are no divisions of books, of chapters or of sections; this was done only by later editors."³⁶ The first edition of 1762 has a lengthy preface where Yakop Nalean, the Patriarch of Constantinople, says that he had to divide the book into 76 chapters, according to the content of the material, to make the reading of the book easier.³⁷ Also in the colophon following the text of the same edition, we read: "It was not an easy labour for Patriarch Yakop to correct the errors and later to divide the discourses of the holy author into chapters."³⁸ It was not until 1826 when the second editor and publisher of the book, Arsen Bagratuni, gave the book its first conventional title, *Elc Alandoc*, and divided it into four books and into numerous chapters.³⁹ The same preface indicates that the publication was done from the manuscript dated 1280 A.D. "with corrections and editings." Acarean is not altogether happy with the "corrections" and the "editings" of the second edition. He says: "In places there are defective parts which are completed by the editors themselves. These completions, no matter how skillful and fitting, still remain fictitious There are also many sections with more acceptable readings in the manuscript than in the printed text, thus creating only textual distortion."⁴⁰

Among the eleven textual differences Acarean points out, for example, the word *apstamb*⁴¹ which is used in Eznik for seven times. The manuscript repeats the word as *apastamb* in all seven cases as against the *apstamb* in the published edition. Acarean is well disturbed at such a change and concludes that the original spelling should be preserved since the word is prefixed by the Iranian *apa* in the fifth century Armenian literary language. Another deliberate misspelling on the part of the editors is the word *asorneyk*⁴² which in the manuscript is *storneyk*. Because in the *bolorigir* script *as* and *sd* are very

much alike, the editors of Eznik have preferred the first reading thus creating certain geographical people by the name of the Assyrians⁴³ who supposedly used the word *ays* to mean satan. Acarean not only rejects the word as it is printed because of the inexplicable *n* in the centre, but also firmly re-establishes the original reading of it found in the manuscript as *storneayk'*, meaning the "southerners", which gives "a most valid and ancient identification and information on the fifth century Armenian language."⁴⁴ The analysis of this statement in Eznik leads Acarean to believe that originally two dialects existed in Armenia, namely, the higher and the lower dialects, the one spoken in the North and the one used in the South. For the same reason Eznik, being from Kolb, spoke the first dialect and separated himself from the others when saying "because when we say that . . . , the *storneayk'* say. . . ." The word stems from *storin*, meaning the lower dialect, as well as those who spoke the lower dialect. After Acarean and before Maries other noted scholars attempted certain textual criticisms aiming at a better understanding of Eznik's text. Among them are Biwzandac'i,⁴⁵ T'ornyan,⁴⁶ Nahapetean,⁴⁷ Adontz,⁴⁸ and Durean.⁴⁹ It was only recently that A. A. Abrahamyan⁵⁰ suggested some fourteen new readings and corrections in Eznik which, however, were promptly criticized by M. Minasean⁵¹ who found those corrections unnecessary and "not contributing to the scholarship." Having mentioned some of the textual and semantic problems we now turn to the sources of Eznik which have attracted the attention of Galemk'earean, Schmid, and Maries. According to Maries "an entire book will be needed for the proper treatment of this matter."⁵²

For sometime Eznik's treatise was regarded as an original work. In 1865 G. Zarbhanelean⁵³ pointed out that certain passages concerning both the Persian religion and the Marcionite heresy bore resemblance to passages in the *Heresies* of Epiphanius⁵⁴ (d. 403). In 1889 H. T'orocean found other passages paralleled in the *Homilies on the Hexaemeron* of Basil of Caesarea⁵⁵ (d. 379). Finally G. Galemkearean showed that a large number of passages were taken almost verbatim from Methodius of Olympus⁵⁶ (d.312), from Aristides of Athens (d.140)⁵⁷ and from Hippolytus (d.236).⁵⁸ Later in 1924 L. Ma-

ries re-evaluated the problem of Eznik's sources in his *De Deo* and reached the conclusion that Methodius' *Peri Auteksousiou* was the most used source among the other church Fathers. Methodius' work dealt with a certain Valentine by way of a dialogue on the nature of the matter and on the origin of the evil. It primarily showed that the matter was created and that the evil was not originated from the matter, but rather, from the abuse of the free will. It is now obvious that Eznik translated portions from Methodius' book⁵⁹ without mentioning his sources. It is objectionable, however, the method that Galemk'ear-ean had used in translating the pertinent passages of Methodius from the original Greek into the classical Armenian⁶⁰ for the purpose of his comparison even with the possible temptation of utilizing Eznik's text itself. Maries⁶¹ regrets that Galemk'ear-ean was led to use Eznik's style in order to harmonize Methodius with Eznik. He also thinks that it would have been preferable and critical indeed if simply the Greek text of Methodius was published next to Eznik's text. Moreover, Maries underlines the originality of Eznik despite the multiplicity of his sources. He states:

*"No doubt, for these developments Eznik has utilized other Fathers, Greek and Syrian. He has used them in a strong measure without sufficiently mentioning his sources. . . . Nonetheless, he stands on vigorous thought all the way and his thinking governs continuously his entire discourse. Even if all of Eznik's work was proven to be a collection of borrowed material, surely he himself has become the initiator and the agent of his work. The planning of the work and the choosing of the philosophical data will suffice to establish his originality as well as to reserve for his literary personality a first rank value."*⁶²

Maries' observation is supplemented also by Adontz who is inclined to see free translations or "co-incidences" rather than immediate and intentional excerpts.⁶³

Eznik's basic source for his references, one should remember, has been the Bible itself, which in some cases are variant readings as compared with the Armenian translation of the Septuagint.⁶⁴

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ The title was given as late as 1826 by Arsen Bagraduni. *The Refutation of the Sects*, Venice, 1826 (in Armenian). The manuscript does not bear any title, while the first publication of Eznik's treatise in Smyrna in 1762 by Abraham Vardapet bore the title of *Girk' Enddimut'eanc'*.
- ² Louis Maries, *Le De Deo d'Eznik de Kolb, connu sous le nom de "Contre les Sectes,"* Paris, 1924, p. 93.
- ³ It was Nirschl who for the first time included the Armenian literature and specifically Eznik in his patrology with the recommendation of P. Vetter who has added that "the treatise of Eznik is a singular phenomenon in patrology, his style being perhaps the most polished kind in the Armenian classical literature." *Lehrbuch der Patrologie*, Mainz, 1885, col.III, p. 231. According to L. Maries "The *De Deo* assures Eznik the high and durable glory which attaches itself to the names of great writers and reserves him an important rank among the church Fathers." *Patrologia Orientalis*, XXVIII, 4, p. 5:543. To this it should be added that presently, from the point of view of patrology, a special attention is focused on Eznik by the University of Munster, the department of Neutestamentliche Textforschung, with the interest of classifying the New Testament quotations and allusions that are extant in Eznik's treatise. Cf. private correspondence, Z. A.
- ⁴ G. T. Mkrt'ean, H. Y. Acarean, *Examination and Collation of Eznik's newly discovered Manuscript*, Vienna, 1904 (in Arm.).
- ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 4.
- ⁶ *De Deo*, 1924, p. 2.
- ⁷ L. Maries, *Eznik de Kolb De Deo*, *Patrologia Orientalis*, vol. 28, fasc. 3-4, Paris, 1959.
- ⁸ Eznik of Kolb, *The Refutation of the Sects*, tr. and ed. by A. A. Abrahamyan. Erevan, 1970.
- ⁹ Grigoris Galemk'earan, *The Most Recent Sources of Eznik's Book Against the Sects*, Vienna, 1919 (in Arm.).
- ¹⁰ *De Deo*, Paris, 1924.
- ¹¹ Koriwn, *Life of Mastoc'*, Erevan, 1962, p. 118. Movses Xorenac'i, *History of the Armenians*, Erevan, 1968 p. 303.
- ¹² In the *Nik' Havadoy*, a collection of the doctrines of the holy Fathers, which was compiled during the years of Catholikos Komitas (615-628), Eznik's name is referred to as one of the outstanding Armenian church fathers, both as a translator and as a theologian. Cf. *Nik'-Havadoy*, Ejmiacin, 1914, pp. 51, 130.
- ¹³ Koriwn, p. 188 ff.
- ¹⁴ Elise, *On the History of Vardan and the Battle of the Armenians*, ed. by E. Ter-Minasean, Erevan, 1957, p. 27.
- ¹⁵ Lazar P'arpec'i, *The History of the Armenians and the Letter to Vahan Mamikonean*, ed. by G. Ter-Mkrt'ean and St. Malxasean, Tiflis, 1904, p. 44.
- ¹⁶ Eznik of Kolb, p. 6.
- ¹⁷ Adontz, N. "Critical Views on Eznik" (On the occasion of L. Maries' *De Deo*), *Bazmavep*, 1925, p. 197.
- ¹⁸ Elise, p. 28 ff.
- ¹⁹ *De Deo*, p. 11.
- ²⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- ²¹ Eznik, p. 141 f.
- ²² See Schmid's Introduction to his German translation of 1900. Cf. Appendix I in Kalemk'earan's book, p. 14 f.
- ²³ Eznik, pp. 156, 160, 252.
- ²⁴ *De Deo*, p. 22.
- ²⁵ G. Gabrielyan, H. *History of the Armenian Philosophical Thought*, Erevan, 1956, pp. 136 ff. (in Arm.)

- ²⁶Adontz, N. *Bazmavep*, 1925, p. 198 ff. Xac'eryan, L. *Patma-Banasirakan Handes*, II, 1962, p. 188 ff.
- ²⁷*De Deo*, p. 22.
- ²⁸Eznik, I, 28, p. 111.
- ²⁹*I*, 5, p. 23.
- ³⁰*I*, 1, p. 5.
- ³¹*I*, 2, p. 10.
- ³²*I*, 7, p. 29.
- ³³*I*, 11, pp. 40, 41.
- ³⁴*Examination and Collation*.
- ³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 7.
- ³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 20.
- ³⁷Arsen Lazikean, *Armenian Modern Bibliography and Encyclopaedia of the Armenian Life*, I, Venice 1909–1912, p. 551.
- ³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 552.
- ³⁹Preface of Eznik Kolbac'i, Venice, 1826. Cf. L. Maries, *De Deo*, 1924, p. 17.
- ⁴⁰Acarean, p. 70 f.
- ⁴¹Eznik, pp. 53, 91.
- ⁴²*Ibid.*, p. 92.
- ⁴³L. Maries has included in his critical edition the corrected form of the word, but curiously enough he has translated it as "les gens du sud (i.e. les Syriens)." *Patrologia Orientalis*, XVIII, 3, p. 452 and 4, p. 588.
- ⁴⁴Acarean, p. 74.
- ⁴⁵"K'nnaser," I, Stockholm, 1887.
- ⁴⁶*Anthology of the Ancient Literature*, Vienna, 1891.
- ⁴⁷*Ullagrut'iwnk' Azgayin Matenagrac'*, Venice, 1907.
- ⁴⁸"Critical Views on Eznik," *Bazmavep*, 1925, 1926.
- ⁴⁹"Corrections and Observations," *Ambolj Erker*, VI, Jerusalem, 1935.
- ⁵⁰"A few Textual Interpretations of Eznik's Treatise," *Patma-Banasirakan Handes*, II, 1970, pp. 93 ff.
- ⁵¹"On a few Recent Textual Interpretations of Eznik's Treatise," *Sion*, 5–6, 7–8, 9–10, 1971.
- ⁵²*De Deo*, p. 34.
- ⁵³*Literary History of Ancient and Modern Armenia* (in Arm.), Venice, 1865, 1878, I, p. 304.
- ⁵⁴Epiphanius (c. 315–403), Bishop of Salamis and an ardent upholder of the faith of Nicaea. Of his writings the most important was his *Panarion*, commonly known as the "Refutation of all the Heresies." J. P. Migne, PG, xli–xliii. Critical text of *Ancoratus* and *Heresies* were edited by K. Holl in *Die griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Berlin, 1897), 3 volumes, 1915–1933.
- ⁵⁵Basil of Caesarea (c. 330–379), is one of the three Cappadocian Fathers, educated at Caesarea in Cappadocia, Constantinople, and Athens in the best pagan and Christian culture of his day. In 370 he was appointed to succeed Eusebius in the see of Caesarea, and held this office for the rest of his life. Cf. J. P. Migne, PG, xxix, pp. 3–208.
- ⁵⁶Methodius of Olympus was the Bishop of Lycia and one of the assailants of Origen. He wrote extensively. His work on free will is a defence of human liberty against the fatalism of the Gnostics. Considerable portions of the Greek text of this writing has come down. Cf. *De Libero Arbitrio* (Greek text with Latin translation), J. P. Migne PG, xviii, 1857, pp. 239–266. English translation by W. R. Clark in *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, Edinburgh, 1864.
- ⁵⁷Aristides of Athens was a Christian philosopher and apologist. In 1878 part of his "Apology" was published with an Armenian translation at Venice. In 1891 a Syriac translation of the whole work, discovered in 1891 on Mt. Sinai, was edited by J. R. Harris, and, in an appendix it was mentioned that the original Greek was to be found in the apology for

Christianity in the "Lives of Barlaam and Josaphat." See the Syriac text edited by J. R. Harris *The Apology of Aristides on behalf of the Christians*, with appendix and Greek text edited by J. A. Robinson in the *Cambridge Texts and Studies*, I, 1891.

⁵⁸Hippolytus (c. 170–c. 236) was an ecclesiastical writer and doctor of the Roman Church who took an active part in attacking Sabellianism, Hippolytus' principal work is his "Refutation of all Heresies," of which books 4–10 were found in a manuscript of Mount Athos and published under the title "Philosophoumena" in 1851 at Oxford by E. Miller.

⁵⁹*Peri Auteksousiou*. The entire text in Greek original is not restored. G. N. Bonwetsch discovered in 1891 the slavonic translation of Methodius' work rendered in XII century and published it the same year with a German translation of the text.

⁶⁰*The Most Recent Sources*, pp. 6, 22.

⁶¹*De Deo*, p. 13 ff. Cf. Abrahamyan, *Eznik of Kolb*, p. 24.

⁶²*De Deo*, p. 33.

⁶³"Bazmavep," 1925, p. 294.

⁶⁴E. Dourean, *Ambolj Erker*, VI, Jerusalem, 1935, pp. 365 ff.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelyan, M. *History of the Armenian Ancient Literature*, vol. I, Erevan, 1944.
- Adontz, N. "Critical Views on Eznik," *Bazmavep*, 1925, 1926.
- Akinean, N. "The Letter of Eznik of Kolb to Masdoc' Vardapet," *Handes Amsoreay*, 1935.
- Biwzandec'i, N. *K'nnaser*, I, Stockholm, 1887.
- Dourean, E. "The German Translation of Eznik," *Masis*, 1900, No. 24, 26, 31.
- Ambolj Erker*, VI, Jerusalem, 1935.
- "Corrections and Observations." *Ibid.*, pp. 403 ff.
- "Observations on Eznik's Biblical Quotations." *Ibid.* pp. 365 ff.
- Zarbhanalean, G. *History of the Armenian Ancient Literature*, Venice, 1886.
- T'ornean, T'. *Anthology of the Ancient Literature*, Vienna, 1891.
- Xostikean, M. *Ethnographic Material in Eznik's "Elc Alantoc," Azgagrakan Handes*, XVI, 1917.
- Kiwleserean, B. "Eznik (Minor Observations)," *Handes Amsoreay*, 1907.
- Vetter, P. *Armenian Studies*, of [Vetter]. Vienna, 1895.
- T'orosean, H. "Eznik and His Treatise." *Bazmavep*, 1889.
- Nahapeteian, G. "Elc Alandoc' of Eznik of Kolb." *Bazmavep*, 1925. *Bazmavep*, 1908.
- Somouncean, V. "Biography and Character of Eznik Vardapet Kolbac'i." *Bazmavep*, 1893.
- Tasean, Y. "Xosrovik and 'The Book of the Heretics'." *Handes Amsoreay*, 1892.
- P'ec'ikean, E. "Collation and Examination of Eznik's text and the printings." *Bazmavep*, 1928, 1929.
- "The Quest of Eznik from Nalean to Dourean." *Bazmavep*, 1930.
- "The Philosophic Words in 'Elc Alandoc'." *Bazmavep*, 1921.
- Criticisms on Eznik's German Translation *Handes Amsoreay*, 1901.
- Gelzer "Eznik und die Entwicklung der persischen Religions-systems." *Zeitschrift fur armenische Philologie*, Marburg, 1902.
- Mordant, Ernest "Eznig, Docteur armenien du cinquieme siecle." *Revue des Etudes Armeniennes*, nouvelle serie, Tome VII, 1970, Paris.
- Dulaurier, E. "Cosmogonie des Perse d'apres Eznig." *Revue de l'Orient*, V, Paris, 1857.
- Ermoni, V. "Marcion dans la litterature armenienne." *Revue de l'Orient chretien*, 1896.
- Maries, L. *Etude sur quelques noms et verbes d'existence chez Eznik*, Paris, 1928.